

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/611,934	07/03/2003	Sadao Kanbe	45360	3959	
1609 7590 09/25/2008 ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P.			EXAM	EXAMINER	
1300 19TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON., DC 20036			HAIDER, SAIRA BANO		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,934	KANBE ET AL.	
Examiner		Art Unit	
	SAIRA HAIDER	1796	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- 1. X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

- 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
 - appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
- 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) X will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
 - The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
 - Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:
 - Claim(s) rejected: 9 and 12-14.
 - Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: ___

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- 11. X The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other:

/Randy Gulakowski/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The proposed amendment will be entered because it clarifies the issue raised under 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, the 112, first paragraph rejection of claims 9 and 12-14 is withdrawn

The examiner maintains the position set forth in the Final Office Action. In paragraph 8 of the Office Action mailed on 6/24/2008, the examiner is stating that Hayashi falls to discloses the claimed w% of the microcapsules, not that it falls to disclose any w% of microcapsules. The examiner then directs (in paragraph 9 of the action) to [0118] of Hayashi which exemplifies about 0.71-16w% of microcapsules. Applicant's argued that such w/k cannot be found on [0018], however, as noted, the citation to [0118].

Applicants argue that it would not have been otwious to increase the amount of the microcapsules. However the examiner has set forth reational lending to show that an increase in the amount of microcapsules would yield beneficial results. Furthermore, it is not necessary that Liang solve the same problem as applicants. The reference recognizes size distribution as a result effective variable For both arguments MPEP § 2144.05 holds that generally, differences in concentration will not support the patentability of subject references do by the prior art unless there is evidence indicated such a concentration is critical. Wherein applicants have failed to provide evidence that the concentration is critical, and is

Specifically, the evidence provided in the Declaration merely affirms that the claimed subject matter functions as it was intended to function. The evidence fails to provide proof of unexpectedly improved properties. The Office Action detailed the specific deficiencies of the declaration, which will not be repeated herein. Accordingly, in view of the foreigning the rejection has been maintained.